REMARKS

Favorable consideration and allowance of the Claims of the present application are respectfully requested.

Status of the Claims

Claims 1, 2, 4-11 are pending in the application.

Claim 1 is currently amended by incorporating elements of Claim 3.

Claim 3 is canceled.

Claim 4, which is originally dependent from Claim 3, is accordingly amended to be dependent from Claim 1.

Claims 5-9 are allowed.

Claim 10 is currently amended by introducing corresponding elements incorporated in Claim 1. The support of the amendments to Claim 10 can be found throughout the Description, e.g. in paragraphs [0062], [0063] and [0051] of the Description.

No new matters are introduced into the pending Claims.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Hardjono* (WO, 00/33509). Claims 3-4 are rejected under U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hardjono* in view of *Novaes* (U.S. Patent Application 2002/0165977). Claims 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hardjono* in view of *Song et al.* (U.S. Patent Application Publication No.: 2003/0211843) and further in view of *Takahashi* (U.S. Patent No.: 6,064,989).

As amended, independent Claims 1 and 10 incorporate elements previously recited in Claim 3, which is now canceled. The Applicant respectfully submits that the amended Claim 1

8

and its dependent claims 2 and 4 are unobvious over *Hardjono* in view of *Novaes* at least because none of *Hardjono* and *Novaes* discloses or teaches the element "said multicast source authentication information table contains a corresponding relationship between multicast source address and multicast address" of Claim 1, and also respectfully submits that the amended Claim 10 and its dependent Claim 11 are unobvious over *Hardjono* in view of *Song et al.* and further in view of *Takahashi* for similar reasons.

The Office Action cites *Hardjono* as disclosing that all the authorized members of the multicast are recorded in a database (*Hardjono*, page 6, lines 5-11) and *Novaes* as disclosing that the group ID (multicast address) is the result of an AND operation between the IP address and the subnet mask calculated and that each group has a membership list associated with it (*Novaes*, paragraph 0077, lines 7-9 and paragraph 0078, lines 1-4).

However, for the sake of argument, while the authorized members of the multicast disclosed in *Hardjono* may be equated to the "multicast address" of Claim 1, i.e. the destination address of the multicast, the authorized members of the multicast disclosed in *Hardjono* does not disclose or suggest the "multicast source address" of Claim 1, i.e. the address of the initiator of a multicast. As stated in page 6, lines 14-16 of *Hardjono*, "the query message may be generated and transmitted across the Internet 108 to all subnets 102 having an authorized member listed in the member list". As also stated on page 9, lines 8-12 of *Hardjono*, "the initiator transmits both the ... and ... to each network user in the member list (i.e., the authorized members of the multicast) via secure channels." In connection with the description of the process of *Hardjono*, while the authorized members of the multicast disclosed in *Hardjono* may equate to the "multicast address" of Claim 1, i.e. the address of the destination of a multicast, it is not the same as the "multicast source address" of Claim 1, i.e. the address of the initiator of a multicast.

9

The Applicant also notes that the disclosure "the group ID (multicast address) is the result of an AND operation between the IP address and the subnet mask calculated and that each group has a membership list associated with it" of *Novaes* does not concern the multicast source address.

The combination of *Hardjono* and *Novaes* at most only concerns multicast address, not multicast source address. Those references, however, do not disclose, suggest, or teach "multicast source authentication information", let alone, "a corresponding relationship between multicast source address and multicast address" of Claim 1.

Therefore, the aforementioned element of "said multicast source authentication information table contains a corresponding relationship between multicast source address and multicast address" of Claim 1 is not taught in either *Hardjono* or *Novaes*.

Moreover, *Hardjono* does not disclose, suggest, or teach the above-described technical feature of Claim 1 and its application in the solution of Claim 1. *Hardjono* aims to solve the problems in the prior art that "a member of a subnet having an authorized member of a multicast often can receive data messages from a subnet network device without being detected by the authorized members of such multicast" (lines 25-27 of *Hardjono*) and "when the encryption key is obtained by an unauthorized user, ... the unauthorized user thus can decrypt each received message with the encrypted key". That is, *Hardjono* aims to provide an apparatus and method for limiting an unauthorized multicast destination from receiving the multicast message, but not as indicated in the present application, for limiting an unauthorized multicast source from sending a multicast message without restriction. Therefore *Hardjono* does not disclose, suggest, or teach the above-described technical feature of Claim 1 and its application in the solution of Claim 1.

10

For at least the above reasons, amended Claim 1 is new over *Hardjono* and non-obvious over *Hardjono* in view of *Novaes*.

With regard to Claims 2 and 4, which is dependent from Claim 1, it is believed for at least the same reasons stated above in connection with Claim 1, *Hardjono* in view *Novaes* fails to teach Claims 2 and 4.

With regard to the amended Claim 10, which contains a technical feature "said multicast source authentication information tables each contain a corresponding relationship between multicast source address and multicast address", the same foregoing reasons apply. In addition to the reasons as stated above for Claim 1, the applicant also notes that this technical feature of Claim 10 is not disclosed by *Song et al.* and *Takahashi*. Therefore, the applicant respectively submits that the amended Claim 10 and accordingly its dependent Claim 11 are non-obvious over *Hardjono* in view of *Song et al.* and *Takahashi*, and even further in view of *Novaes*.

Therefore, for the above reasons the applicant respectfully requests the rejection of Claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and the rejection of Claims 4, 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance be issued.

11

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with the Applicant's attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned , Applicant's attorney, at the following telephone number: (516) 742-4343.

Respectfully submitted,

/Eunhee Park/

Eunhee Park
Registration No. 42,976

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER, P.C.
400 Garden City Plaza, Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343
EP:vh